

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
)
Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.)
)
Serial No.: 10/705,604)
)
Filed: November 10, 2003)
)
For: Manufacturing Method Of Emitting)
Device)
)
Examiner: James Lin)
)
Confirmation No.: 6065)
)
Art Unit: 1762)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE (C) TO OFFICE ACTION

Applicants have the following response to the Office Action of May 16, 2007.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103:

1. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 22-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (U.S. 2002/0075422) in view of Kawase (GB 2,360,489) and Morii (JP 2001/276726).
2. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 22-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazawa (U.S. 2003/0166311) in view of Sekiya (JP 2003/264072).
3. Claims 10-11 and 22-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kawase and Morii and further in view of Miyashita et al. (U.S. 2002/0155215).
4. Claims 10-11 and 22-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Sekiya and further in view of Miyahashi.
5. Claims 16-17 and 22-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kawase and Morii and further in view of Yamazaki (U.S. 2002/0164416).

6. Claims 16-17 and 22-28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Sekiya and further in view of Yamazaki.
7. Claims 14-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kawase, Morii and Miyashita and further in view of Konuma et al. (U.S. 2002/0030443).
8. Claims 14-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Sekiya and Miyashita and further in view of Konuma.
9. Claims 20-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Kawase, Morii and Yamazaki and further in view of Konuma.
10. Claims 20-21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazawa in view of Sekiya and Yamazaki and further in view of Konuma.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons explained below.

Rejections 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9

More specifically, with regard to rejections 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 listed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, even if properly combined (which Applicants do not admit is proper), do not disclose or suggest all the claimed elements of the rejected claims. As a result, the claims are allowable over these references.

In particular, the Examiner cites Kimura, Kawase, and Morii in each of these rejections (plus additional references in some of the rejections). The Examiner contends that Kimura teaches a method of making an EL display device, and that an EL solution 114A is ejected towards the pixel electrode. The Examiner admits that Kimura “does not explicitly teach ejecting under a pressure lower than atmosphere pressure” (emphasis added). The Examiner then cites Kawase and contends that Kawase “teaches that a flow of gas across the substrate and heating of the substrate during deposition can increase the drying speed in order to form a uniform EL layer, but does not explicitly teach the use of a vacuum” (emphasis added). The Examiner further contends that Morii “teaches a